

Remarks

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13 and 18 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 9, 11 and 19 have been cancelled.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 1-3, 5-10, 12, 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kageyu, et al. (U.S. 5,745,167) patent taken in view of the Davis (U.S. 5,936,666) patent. Applicants have amended applicants' independent claims 1, 6, 8, 12, and 18, and with and with respect to such claims, as amended, and their respective dependent claims, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' independent claims 1, 6, 8, 12, and 18 have been amended to better define applicants' invention. More particularly, applicants' independent claim 1 has now been amended to recite a control apparatus capable of controlling first instrument and second instrument, which have specified functions and move relatedly with mutual movements, in which a control right acquisition device acquires a control right to control the second instrument by using one acquisition command, and a control restriction device restricts to control both the first instrument and second instrument when the control right of the second instrument is acquired by another apparatus. Claim 1 further recites a control permission device for permitting to control both the first instrument and the second instrument when the control right of the second instrument is acquired by using the one acquisition command. Applicants' independent claims 6, 8, 12 and 18 have been similarly amended.

Such construction is not taught or suggested by the cited Kageyu, et al. and Davis patents. More particularly, the Kageyu, et al. patent teaches a camera system in which camera acquisition is determined based on priority. In the system of this patent, if a second monitor station wishes to acquire control of a camera and the camera is being controlled by a first

monitor station, a determination is made of whether control by the second monitor station has priority over control by the first monitor station. If priority exists, control of the camera passes to the second station. If not, the second station is denied control.

The Davis patent, on the other hand, concerns a surveillance system having sensors (e.g. PIR sensor and video camera) with overlapping fields of view. The patent teaches interrelated the operation of the two sensors by sectionalizing the fields of view so as to realize improved surveillance by the system.

Neither the Kageyu, et al. patent nor the Davis patent, however, concern a system in which control right over a first camera results in restriction to control a second camera related to the first camera. In the Kageyu, et al. patent, when control right is acquired by one camera, there is nothing taught as to restricting control of another camera. Additionally, nothing is taught in the Kayegu, et al. patent as to permitting to control both a first and second camera when the control right of the second camera is acquired by using one acquisition command from an control right acquisition device. In the Kayegu, et al. system, when control over a plurality of cameras is sought, a user has to issue commands to all the cameras.

The Davis patent, moreover, discusses nothing regarding acquiring control rights of the individual sensors, nor the need to control them in an interrelated manner, nor the restricting of the control of a first sensor when control of a second sensor is acquired, nor the use of one acquisition signal to obtain control over multiple sensors. The combined teachings of the Kageyu, et al. and Davis patents thus fail to teach or suggest applicants' claimed invention.

Thus, applicant's amended independent claims, and their respective dependent claims, in reciting, in one form or another, a control right acquisition device for acquiring a control


right to control a second instrument by using one acquisition command, a control restriction device for restricting to control both a first instrument and the second instrument when the control right of the second instrument is acquired by another apparatus, and a control permission device for permitting to control both the first instrument and the second instrument when the control right of the second instrument is acquired by using the one acquisition command, patentably distinguish over the Kageyu, et al. and Davis patents.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: July 15, 2004

ROBIN, BLECKER & DALEY
330 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017
T (212) 682-9640

Respectfully submitted,


John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,359
An Attorney of Record